



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,953	07/26/2001	Aravinda Korala	0125US-KAL	8308
23521	7590	11/28/2003		
SALTAMAR INNOVATIONS 30 FERN LANE SOUTH PORTLAND, ME 04106				
			EXAMINER CHRISTMAN, KATHLEEN M	
			ART UNIT 3713	PAPER NUMBER 8
DATE MAILED: 11/28/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/915,953

Applicant(s)

KORALA, ARAVINDA

Examiner

Kathleen M Christman

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3713

### **DETAILED ACTION**

In response to the election filed 09/10/2003; claims 1-20 are pending.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Invention II (claims 13-20) in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. Claims 1-13 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 7.
2. The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to the patent applications 09/870,293 and 09/870057 is improper because the incorporation reference does not include the names of the inventors or the titles of the applications.

#### ***Drawings***

3. Applicant is requested to provide a descriptive legend for each of the structural elements in the drawings currently represented in the form of a hollow rectangle, for example those denoted by symbols 3-5 in Figure 1, and 10-13 in Figure 2. Further the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the method of training a user of a self-service kiosk must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 3713

4. Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The preamble of claim 13 recites a method of training a user of a self-service kiosk however; the recited steps do not result in "training". The recited steps merely recite a method for providing a simulator of a self-service kiosk at an address. The limitation "the address" in lines 20-21 of claim 13, "the on-line training facility" in claim 17 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 14 recites the limitation "the services provided" in line 28-29, this statement is in contradiction to claim 13, in that claim 13 recites the kiosk providing "a service". Regarding claims 14-16, it is unclear whether these limitations are meant to limit the simulator or the self-service kiosk. Regarding claim 20, it is unclear as to whether this limitation is meant to further limit the simulation. Claims 17-19 are rejected for their incorporation of at least one of the above deficiencies through their dependencies.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 13-20, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al (US 2003/0083943 A1). As best understood and given the broadest reasonable

Art Unit: 3713

interpretation of the claims the invention of Adams et al may be interpreted as the claimed "method of training a user of a self-service kiosk" as in claim 13. The step of "providing a self-service kiosk for providing a service to a user" is considered equivalent to Adams et al general teaching of providing an electronic game. The service being the playing of the game. Adams et al teaches providing electronic games online, which include demonstrations of the game so as to teach the user how to use the game in paragraph 20. This function is equated to the step of "providing at said address and online simulator simulating the function of said self-service kiosk". The service requires the user to enter information or make selections relating to the service provided, as in claim 14, is taught by at least the user being required to input the amount of a wager (i.e. coins wagered) or select the option to spin, see the last two sentences of paragraph 16. The information being entered into a field, as in claim 15 and similarly in the simulation of the machine as in claim 16, is shown in Figure 3 under the "coins" counter.

Adams et al does not specifically teach the step of "on or adjacent to the self-service kiosk, providing the address of an online simulator", as in claim 13. However, Adams et al does teach the advertisement's are placed around the housing of the game in paragraph 52. The examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in the art to provide a web address in an advertisement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the web address of the sponsoring company where the electronic versions of the game are located in the advertisements so as to attract players of the electronic game to the company web page. Regarding claim 17-19, Adams et al does not specifically teach that the address of the "on-line training facility" (interpreted as the simulator) is provided by a removable printed document. The examiner takes official notice that removable advertisements such as business cards (claim 18) are old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the advertisements that include the online address in these forms so as to allow the user to conveniently recall or look up the address at a future time. Regarding claim 20, although Adams et al does not specifically state that the simulation also includes the simulation of peripherals other than a display this feature is clearly a matter of design choice. The actual components selected for a simulations display do not effect the overall function of the simulator only make it more

Art Unit: 3713

attractive. As such it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to visually simulate other peripherals (such as push buttons, a lever, etc.) in the on-line demonstration of the game.

**Conclusion**

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- a. Hayward et al (US 2003/0023703 A1) teaches a system for downloading immediate help files which demonstrate how to perform functions on a computer peripheral
  - b. Judd et al (US 5602982) teaches a software trainer which includes a "Show Me" feature for demonstrating how to perform a function in the software
  - c. Hoehn-Saric et al (US 5915973) teaches a kiosk based testing center where a user may call in to a call center if difficulties are experienced

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathleen M Christman whose telephone number is (703) 308-6374. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teresa Walberg can be reached on (703) 308-1327. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.



Kathleen M. Christman



Teresa Walberg  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700